DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 448 CG 017 722

AUTHOR O'Neil, James M.; And Others
TITLE Data on College Men's Gender Role Conflict and Strain.
SPONS AGENCY Kansas Univ., Lawrence. General Research Fund.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Canada, August 24-28, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Emotional Response; Higher Education; *Males; *Personality Traits; *Role Conflict; *Sex Role; Stress Variables
IDENTIFIERS *Strain

ABSTRACT

Gender role conflict exists when gender roles have negative impact or consequences on the self or others. To examine the degree to which college males reflect gender role conflict and strain and to determine whether men who describe themselves as instrumental (masculine), expressive (feminine), both instrumental and expressive (androgynous), or neither (undifferentiated) report differential degrees of gender role conflict, 527 college men completed two Fear of Femininity Scales (FOFS-I and FOFS-II), and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). An analysis of the results showed that subjects reflected gender role conflict across the four FOFS-I factors. For success, power and competition, instrumental men reported more agreement than feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated men. For restrictive emotionality, androgynous men had lower scores than masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated men. For homophobia, masculine men and undifferentiated men had higher scores than androgynous or feminine types. For work and family conflicts, no significant differences were found. For FOFS-II: masculine men had higher scores than feminine men on the factor of homophobia; and undifferentiated men had the highest scores on lack of emotional response. These findings suggest that relatively high percentages of men experience role conflict, and that they experience that conflict differentially, contingent on their self-reported attributes. (BL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248448

DATA ON COLLEGE MEN'S GENDER ROLE CONFLICT AND STRAIN

James M. O'Neil
Barbara J. Helms
Robert Gable
Richard Stillson

The University of Connecticut - Storrs

Laurence David
Lawrence S. Wightsman

The University of Kansas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James M. O'Neil
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This research was supported by a grant from the General Research Fund of The University of Kansas. Presented at the ninety-second Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario Canada, August 24-28, 1984. The authors are indebted to Dr. Nancy Betz (Ohio State University) who generously gathered data for us during the Spring semester, 1982.

CG 017722

ABSTRACT

Gender role conflict exists when gender roles have negative impact or consequences on ~~A person~~ the self or others. This research reports empirical data on the degree that college men reflect gender role conflict and strain in their lives. Subjects (N=527) were given two measures of gender role conflict (Fear of Femininity Scale - FOFS I and II) along with the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). Percentages of subjects reflecting gender role conflict on five gender role conflict factors are reported. The degree that subjects with different self expressed attributes (assessed by the PAQ) report different degrees of gender role conflict and strain are reported. Responses to FOFS-I items indicate that subjects reflect gender role conflict varying between 14% and 51% of the time across the factors. Results for FOFS-II indicate that subjects report gender role conflict varying between 19% and 77% across the factors. MANOVA's were performed on each instrument (FOFS-I and FOFS-II) to assess differential conflict between subjects in the four PAQ categories. Univariate follow-up procedures indicated significant differences

($P < .001$) in six of the eight scales. Implications of results for further development of the FOFS and conceptualization about gender role conflict are presented.

Data on College Men's Gender Role Conflict and Strain

The negative effect of socialized gender roles continues to be an area of scientific inquiry. The possible negative effect of gender roles has been described as gender role conflict or sex role strain (Garnets & Pleck, 1979; O'Neil, 1981a, 1982; Pleck, 1981). Gender role conflict is a psychological state where gender roles have negative impact or consequences on a person or others. The ultimate outcome of this conflict is the restriction of the person's ability to actualize his or her human potential or the restriction of someone else's potential. Sex role strain has also been described as an intrapsychic process that can lead to poor psychological adjustment, particularly low self esteem (Garnets & Pleck, 1979).

A recent sex role strain (SRS) paradigm (Pleck, 1981) provides additional understanding of the negative effects of socialized gender roles. This paradigm enumerates ten propositions indicating that gender roles can produce conflict and strain for both sexes. Three of these propositions indicate that: (1) gender roles can lead to negative psychological consequences; (2)

certain gender role characteristics are psychologically dysfunctional; (3) both sexes experience strain and conflict because of gender roles. Pleck's SRS paradigm provides a conceptual base for the empirical study of gender role conflicts emanating from stereotypes of masculininity and femininity.

Men's gender role conflicts have been topics of discussion for some time in the popular literature (Farell, 1974; Fasteau, 1975; Nichols, 1975; Pleck & Sawyer, 1974). Conceptual analysis of men's problems have also emerged in the literature (David & Brannon, 1976; O'Neil, 1981a, 1982; Pleck & Pleck, 1980; Scher, 1981; Skovholt, Gormally, Schauble & Davis, 1980). Additionally, four case studies of men have been reported (Komarovsky, 1973, 1976; Levinson, 1978; Vaillant, 1974). There have been limited empirical studies documenting men's conflicts around socialized gender roles. This lack of empirical research on gender role conflict has delayed a scientific understanding of how gender roles produce conflict and strain in people's lives.

A central theme of men's gender role conflict is the fear of femininity (O'Neil, 1981b, 1981c, 1982). The fear of femininity is defined as a strong,

negative emotion associated with so called feminine values, attitudes, and behaviors. These emotional reactions are learned primarily in early childhood when gender identity is being formed by parents, peers, and societal values. Men's fears of their feminine sides and of women have been noted in the theoretical literature for many years (Hays, 1964; Horney, 1967; Jung, 1953, 1954; Lederer, 1968; Menninger, 1942). Most of these analyses of men's fears about femininity rely upon a psychodynamic foundation. Jung's archetype in men, the anima, is a well known concept that is relevant to men's difficulty integrating their feminine sides. More recently, Levinson, et.al., (1978), in their case study of 40 men found that these men neglected or repressed the feminine sides of self and regarded those parts of themselves that were feminine as dangerous. Men's fears about their femininity have direct relevance to patterns of gender role conflict and strain.

Patterns of gender role conflict and strain associated with the fear of femininity have been described in the literature (O'Neil, 1981a, 1981b, 1982). Figure 1 shows the five patterns of gender

role conflict and strain including: (1) Success, Power, and Competition Issues, (2) Restrictive Emotionality - Lack of Emotional Response, (3)

Insert Figure 1 About Here

Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia, (4) Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations, (5) Public Embarrassment From Gender Role Deviance. Initial factor analytic data support the existence of these factors (O'Neil, David, & Wrightsman, 1982). These factors were found using the Fear of Femininity Scales (FOFS-I and FOFS-II), with a college student population. FOFS-I assesses men's reports of attitudes and behaviors related to gender related conflicts. FOFS-II assesses men's degree of conflict and comfort in different gender related situations. The following factors were found using FOFS-I and FOFS-II: Restrictive Emotionality; Success, Power, and Competition Issues; Restrictive Sexual and Affectionate Behavior - Homophobia; Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations; Public Embarrassment From Gender Role Deviance; Lack of Emotional Response. Moderate reliability and validity were also

established for both scales. For FOFS-I, internal consistency reliabilities for the four scales ranged between .75-.85 and the test-retest reliabilities ranged between .72-.86. For FOFS-II, internal consistency reliabilities for the four scales ranged between .59-.70 and the test-retest reliabilities ranged between .78-.83.

The present research moves beyond the construct validity of FOFS-I and FOFS-II. The purpose of the present research is to report the degree that college age males report gender role conflict. There have been no empirical data to demonstrate the degree to which men report gender role conflict and strain. FOFS-I assesses college men's self report about their gender role conflict. Also, there have been no data to assess men's gender conflict in different situations. FOFS-II assesses assesses college men's gender role conflict as it is manifested in specific situations. Additionally, this research determines whether men who describe themselves as instrumental, expressive, both instrumental and expressive, or neither instrumental or expressive, report differential degrees of gender role conflict.

We hypothesize that college age males: (1) will report moderate amounts of gender role conflict; (2) will be moderately undecided about their gender role conflict; (3) will experience gender role conflict differentially depending on their self reported attributes measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ).

METHOD

Subjects

Undergraduate men (N = 527) at two midwestern universities who were enrolled in introductory psychology classes were the subjects. The mean age of the subjects was 19.8 years. Class levels of the subjects included: 57% freshmen, 27% sophomores, 11% juniors, 5% seniors. The marital status of subjects indicated 95% single and 5% married.

Procedures

Subjects were given the two Fear of Femininity Scales as developed by O'Neil, David and Wrightsman (1982). Additionally, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ, Spence & Helmreich, 1978) was administered to all subjects. All scales were scored and submitted to multivariate analysis of variance. Per-

centage and frequency were also calculated.

Measures

Fear of Femininity Scale I (FOFS-I). This scale is a 37-item self report instrument designed to assess aspects of gender role conflict described in the literature (O'Neil, 1981a, 1981b, 1982). This scale asks subjects to agree or disagree about their personal gender role attitudes, behaviors, and conflicts. Repondents are asked to report the degree that they agree or disagree to statements using 6-point Likert Scale ranging from strongly agree (6) to strongly disagree (1). Examples of items from FOFS-I include: "I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings"; "I strive to be more successful than others," "Finding time to relax is difficult for me." Each statement expresses problems in success, power, competition, restrictive emotionality, restrictive affectionate behaviors, homophobia, or conflict between work and leisure in family relations. Thus, a high score assumes and reflects an expression of gender-role conflict and therefore, fears about femininity (O'Neil, 1981b, 1982). Table 1 gives initial factor composition and relia-

data for FOFS-I.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Fear of Femininity Scale II (FOFS-II). This scale is a 16-item self report instrument designed to assess situational dimensions of gender role conflict. This scale asks subjects to report their degree of comfort or conflict in specific gender role conflict situations. Respondents are asked to rate the degree of comfort or conflict in specific situations using a 4-point scale ranging from "very much conflict-very uncomfortable" (4) to "no conflict-very comfortable" (1). Examples of items from FOFS-II include: 1) "Your best friend has just lost his job at the factory where you work. He is obviously upset, afraid, and angry but he has these emotions hidden. How comfortable-uncomfortable are you responding to your friend's intense emotions and fears about unemployment?" 2) There's a guy you've idolized since grade school. He's three years older than you are. In high school he was the star quarterback, validictorian, and very active in the Young Methodist Fellowship. Last year he graduated from college. You have

just learned that he is a homosexual. How much conflict do you feel between your admiration for this person and the fact that he is a homosexual? Each statement expresses problems in Success, Power, Competition, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia, Lack of Emotional Response, or Public Embarrassment from Gender Role Deviance. Thus a high score reflects and assumes an expression of gender role conflict and therefore, fears about femininity (O'Neil, 1981b, 1982). Table 1 gives initial factor composition and reliability data for FOFS-II.

Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). The PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) measures the psychological dimension of masculinity and femininity. The PAQ is a 24-item self report instrument consisting of a number of trait descriptions, each set upon a bipolar scale. These trait descriptions of dispositional properties makes no reference to overt behavior or to the situations in which these dispositions are manifested. Each item describes a characteristic stereotypically believed to differentiate the sexes. The PAQ is divided into three separate scales labeled: Masculinity (M), Femininity (F), and Masculinity-Femininity (MF). In content, the M scale contains

socially desirable traits that are stereotypically more characteristic of males than females and refer to self assertive, instrumental attributes. The F scale contains socially desirable traits that are stereotypically more characteristic of females and refer to interpersonally-oriented expressive qualities. The M-F scale consists of trait dimensions for which the social desirability ratings were related to gender, the ideal woman falling toward the stereotypically feminine pole and the ideal man toward the stereotypically masculine pole (Spense & Helmreich, 1980). Median splits of subjects' PAQ scores produced medians for masculinity (M) and femininity (F) both at 23. These medians were used to classify subjects to masculine (high masculinity, low femininity), feminine (low-high), androgynous (high-high), or undifferentiated (low-low), gender role categories. As defined by Spence and Helmreich (1980), the PAQ assesses respondents self reported attributes of expressiveness and instrumentality. In this study, the men categorized as "masculine" has instrumental traits but is low on expressive traits. The "feminine man" possesses expressive

traits but is low on instrumental traits. The "androgynous man" is high on both instrumental and expressive traits. Finally the "undifferentiated man" is low on both instrumental and expressive traits. In short, the PAQ represents men's self reported attributes of expressiveness and instrumentality. Cronbach's alphas for the short form of the PAQ are .85, .82, and .78 for M, F, and M-F respectively (Spense & Helmreich, 1978).

Analysis

Percentages, frequencies, means, and standard deviations were calculated using the factors shown in Figure 1. Percentages and frequencies on the scale scores were calculated by classifying Likert scale in the following way: strongly agree and agree were sixes and fives; fours and threes were categorized as undecided; and two and ones represented the disagree and strongly disagree category. Two multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were calculated on categories of the PAQ and the factors of FOFS-I and II. Univariate procedures were computed on each scale with Tukey post-hoc procedures to analyze differences between PAQ groups when significant multivariate F's were found.

RESULTS

The means, standard deviations, and percentage rate response for FOFS-I and FOFS-II are found in Table 2. FOFS-I measured the self report attitudes of men regarding factors found in Figure 1. For

Insert Table 2 About Here

Factor I (Success, Power and Competition), 51% gave responses agreeing or strongly agreeing that this factor affected them. Forty-five percent were undecided about this factor and 5% disagreed or strongly disagreed that this factor related to them. For Factor 2 (Restrictive Emotionality), 14% gave responses agreeing or strongly agreeing that this factor affected them. Fifty-three percent were undecided about this factor related to them. For Factor III (Restrictive, Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia), 36% gave responses agreeing or strongly agreeing that this factor affected them. Forty-nine percent were undecided about this factor and 15% disagreed or strongly disagreed that this factor related to them. For Factor IV (Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations),

32% gave responses agreeing or strongly agreeing that this factor affected them. Fifty-three percent were undecided about this factor and 15% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

FOFS-II measured gender role dimensions found in Figure 1. in specific situations. For Factor 1 (Success, Power and Competition Issues), 59% of the subjects reported very much or much conflict or being uncomfortable with these situations. Forty-one percent of the subjects reported some or no conflict and being comfortable and very comfortable with these situations. For Factor II (Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia), 77% of the subjects reported very much or much conflict or being uncomfortable or very uncomfortable with these situations. Twenty-three percent of the subjects reported some or no conflict and being comfortable or very comfortable with these situations. For Factor III (Lack of Emotional Response), 19% of the subjects reported very much or much conflict or being uncomfortable or very uncomfortable with these situations. Eighty-one percent of the subjects reported some or no conflict and being comfortable or very comfortable with these situations. For Factor IV

(Public Embarrassment From Gender Role Deviance), 31% of the subjects reported very much or much conflict or being very uncomfortable or uncomfortable with these situations. Sixty-nine percent of the subjects reported some or no conflict and being comfortable or very comfortable with these situations.

Tables 3 and 4 show the means and standard deviations for the four factor scores of FOFS-I and FOFS-II according to the PAQ categories.

Insert Tables 3 & 4 About Here

For FOFS-I, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) indicated an overall significant main effect, $F(12,1535) = 9.87$, $p. < .000$. Univariate analyses of variance on the four factors indicated significant differences on three of the four factors. Significant differences between PAQ categories were found for Factor I (Success, Power, Competition Issues), $F(3, 519) = 7.86$, $p. < .000$; Factor II (Restrictive Emotionality) $F(3, 522) = 20.43$, $p. < .000$; Factor III (Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia), $F(3, 522) = 9.69$, $p. < .000$. No significant differences

were found for Factor 4 (Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations.

For FOFS-II, multivariate analysis of variance indicated an overall significant main effect, F (12, 1541) = 5.53, $p. < .000$. Univariate analyses of variance on the four factors indicated significant differences on three of the four factors. No significant differences were found for Factor I (Success, Power and Competition Issues). Significant differences between PAQ categories were found for Factor II (Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia), $F(3, 522) = 3.51$, $p. < .05$; Factor III (Lack of Emotional Response) F (3, 522) = 13.43, $p. < .000$; Factor IV (Public Embarrassment from Gender Role Deviance), F (3, 522) = 9.67, $p. < .000$.

Twenty post-hoc analyses were statistically significant on FOFS-I and II across the four PAQ categories. For FOFS-I, instrumental men (masculine) reported agreeing more with Factor I (Success, Power, Competition) than feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated men. For Factor 2 (Restrictive Emotionality) instrumental and expressive men (androgynous) had significantly lower scores than masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated

men. Also, men who were neither expressive nor instrumental (undifferentiated) had significantly higher scores on restrictive emotionality than the three other types. For Factor III, (Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia), instrumental men (masculine) and men who were neither instrumental or expressive (undifferentiated) had significantly higher scores than androgynous and feminine types.

For FOFS-II, instrumental men (masculine) had significantly higher scores than expressive men (feminine) on Factor II (Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia). For Factor III, (Lack of Emotional Response), men who neither instrumental or expressive (undifferentiated) had significantly higher scores than masculine, feminine, and androgynous men. Finally, instrumental men (masculine) had significantly higher scores than androgynous men on this factor.

Discussion

The results provide initial support that college males will reflect and report moderate degrees of gender role conflict and strain. The factors of Success, Power and Competition Issues and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men-Homophobia received the high-

est percentage endorsement by the subjects. Additionally, these results support the hypothesis that relatively high percentages of men will be undecided or unsure about their views of gender role conflict. The hypothesis that men will experience gender role conflict differentially contingent on their self reported attributes of expressiveness and instrumentally was also supported. These results indicate that men with different self-reported instrumental and expressive attributes differ from each other on their reported conflicts and strains in Figure 1. These findings provide some initial discriminate validity data on the FOFS.

Overall, the results do provide some empirical evidence supporting Pleck's (1981) Sex Role Strain (SRS) paradigm for college men. Future research should assess the gender role conflict of adult men across different racial, socioeconomic, and cultural groups. Through additional empirical research on men's gender role conflict and their fears about femininity, more functional models of masculininity can strengthen men's lives.

REFERENCES

David, D.S. & Brannon, R. (1976). The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Farrell, W. (1974). The liberated man. New York: Bantam Books.

Fasteau, M.F. (1974). The male machine. New York: McGraw Hill.

Garnets, L. & Pleck, J.H. (1979). Sex role identity, androgyny, and sex role transcendence: A sex role strain analysis. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3, 270-283.

Hays, H.R. (1964). The dangerous sex: The myth of feminine evil. New York: Pocket Books.

Horney, K. (1967). Feminine Psychology. New York: W.W. Norton.

Jung, C.G. (1953). Animus and Anima, Collected Works, (Vol. 7) New York: Pantheon.

Jung, C.G. (1954). Concerning the archetypes, with special reference to the anima concept. Collected Works, (Vol. 9, Part I) New York: Pantheon.

Komarovsky, M. (1976). Dilemmas of masculinity: A study of college youth. New York: W.W. Norton.

Lederer, W. (1968). The fear of women. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich.

Levinson, D.J., et.al. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Alfred A Knopf.

Menninger, K. (1970). Love against hate. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich.

Nichols, J. (1975). Men's liberation: A new definition of masculinity. New York: Penguin Books.

O'Neil, J.M. (1981a). Male sex-role conflicts, sexism, and masculinity: Psychological implications for men, women and the counseling psychologist. The Counseling Psychologist, 9, 61-80.

O'Neil, J.M. (1981b). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: The fear of femininity in men's lives. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 203-210.

O'Neil, J.M. (1981c, March). A measure of men's fear of femininity: A rationale and initial statement. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), Cincinnati, OH.

O'Neil, J.M. (1982). Gender and sex role conflict and strain in men's lives: Implications for psychiatrists, psychologists, and other human service providers. In K. Solomon & N. Levy (Eds.) Men in transition: Theory and therapy (pp. 5-44). New York: Plenum Press.

O'Neil, J.M., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1982, August). Fear of femininity scale (FOFS): Men's gender role conflict. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Washington, D.C.

Pleck, J. (1981). The myth of masculinity. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Pleck, E.H., & Pleck, J. (1980). The American man. Englewood Cliffs: N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Pleck, J.H. & Sawyer, J. (1974). Men and masculinity. Englewood Cliffs, N J : Prentice Hall.

Scher, M. (1981). Men in hiding: A challenge for the counselor. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 199-202.

Skovholt, T., Gromally, A., Schauble, P. & Davis, R. (1980). Counseling men. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1980). Masculine instrumentality and feminine expressiveness: Their relationship with sex role attitudes and behaviors. Psychology of Woman Quarterly, 5, 147-163.

Solomon, K. & Levy, N. (1982). Men in transition: Theory and therapy. New York: Plenum Press.

Vaillant, G.E. (1974). Natural history of male psychological health. Archives of General Psychiatry, 31, 15-22.

Table 1

Factor Composition and Reliability Data for FOFS-I and II

Factors	Number of Items	Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=527)	Test-Retest Reliabilities N=14)
FOFS-I (Personal Self Report)			
(1) Success, Power, and Competition	13	.85	.84
(2) Restrictive Emotionality	10	.82	.76
(3) Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Homophobia	8	.83	.86
(4) Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations	6	.75	.72
FOFS-II (Situational Self Report)			
(1) Success, Power, and Competition	6	.70	.79
(2) Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Homophobia	4	.76	.78
(3) Lack of Emotional Response	3	.51	.85
(4) Public Embarrassment from Gender Role Deviance	3	.59	.83

Data On 24

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentage Rates For FOFS Scales (I & II)

Fear of Femininity Scale - I				Strongly Agree (6) Agree (5)		Undecided (4,3)		Strongly Disagree (2) Disagree (1)	
	Factors	$\bar{X}^2$	S.D.	f	%	f	%	f	%
Factor 1:	Success, Power, and Competition	4.87	1.29	266	51	237	45	24	5
Factor 2:	Restrictive Emotionality	3.28	1.73	72	14	281	53	174	33
Factor 3:	Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Homophobia	4.26	1.64	188	36	260	49	79	15
Factor 4:	Conflicts Between Work and Leisure-Family Relations	4.20	1.60	169	32	281	53	77	15

Fear of Femininity Scale - II				Very Much Conflict Very Uncomfortable (4)		Much Conflict Uncomfortable (3)		Some Conflict Comfortable (2)		No Conflict Very Comfortable (1)	
	Factors	$\bar{X}^3$	S.D.	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Factor 1:	Success, Power, and Competition	2.61	.609	23	4	289	55	203	39	12	2
Factor 2:	Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Homophobia	2.99	.736	130	25	275	52	111	21	11	2
Factor 3:	Lack of Emotional Response	1.94	.680	5	1	93	18	297	56	132	25
Factor 4:	Public Embarrassment From Gender Role Deviance	2.20	.686	12	2	152	29	294	56	69	13

[1]Sample size was 527.

[2]High score indicates higher self-concern regarding that attribute using scale Strongly Agree (6) to Strongly Disagree (1).

[3]High score indicates higher self-concern regarding that attribute using scale of 4 (high) and 1 (low).

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for PAQ Groups and Factors of the FOFS - I[1,2]

PAQ Groups	N	FOFS Factor 1 $\bar{X}$	FOFS Factor 1 SD	FOFS Factor 2 $\bar{X}$	FOFS Factor 2 SD	FOFS Factor 3 $\bar{X}$	FOFS Factor 3 SD	FOFS Factor 4 $\bar{X}$	FOFS Factor 4 SD
Masculine	120	56.68	8.97	30.98	8.08	30.33	7.85	20.87	5.88
Feminine	118	50.28	11.77	29.69	9.24	27.63	7.68	21.25	5.88
Androgynous	129	53.12	10.76	26.33	8.52	27.04	9.22	21.70	6.60
Undifferentiated	160	52.66	9.59	34.09	8.10	31.39	6.87	21.95	5.32

[1]Factor 1 = Success, Power, Competition
Factor 2 = Restrictive Emotionality
Factor 3 = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Homophobia
Factor 4 = Conflicts Between Work and Leisure - Family Relations

[2]N = 527. NOTE: High score indicates greater self-concern regarding that attribute.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for PAQ Groups and Factors of the FOFS - II[1, 2]

PAQ Groups	N	FOFS Factor 1 $\bar{X}$	FOFS Factor 1 SD	FOFS Factor 2 $\bar{X}$	FOFS Factor 2 SD	FOFS Factor 3 $\bar{X}$	FOFS Factor 3 SD	FOFS Factor 4 $\bar{X}$	FOFS Factor 4 SD
Masculine	120	15.64	2.95	11.99	2.82	5.93	1.78	6.73	1.80
Feminine	118	15.33	3.18	10.96	2.61	5.44	1.69	6.36	1.89
Androgynous	129	14.88	3.44	11.23	2.89	5.37	1.76	6.04	1.79
Undifferentiated	160	15.60	3.11	11.65	2.49	6.52	1.69	7.12	1.67

[1] Factor 1 = Success, Power, Competition
Factor 2 = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Homophobia
Factor 3 = Lack of Emotional Response
Factor 4 = Public Embarrassment from Gender Role Deviance

[2] N = 527. NOTE: High score indicates greater self-concern regarding the situations.

Data On 27

Figure 1. Five Patterns of Gender Role Conflict and Strain Obtained From Fear of Femininity Scales (FOFS-I and II). (O'Neil, David & Wrightsman, 1982).

PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL SEXISM
GENDER ROLE CONFLICT AND STRAIN
CONFLICTS BETWEEN WORK AND FAMILY RELATIONS
RESTRICTIVE EMOTIONALITY LACK OF EMOTIONAL RESPONSE
SUCCESS, POWER, COMPETITION ISSUES
PUBLIC EMBARASSMENT FROM GENDER ROLE DEVIANCE
RESTRICTIVE SEXUAL AND AFFECTIONATE BEHAVIOR - HOMOPHOBIA
FEAR OF FEMININITY
MEN'S GENDER ROLE SOCIALIZATION
THE MASCULINE MYSTIQUE AND VALUE SYSTEM